

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
1-1	comment card	South San Joaquin Irrigation District, Stevan Stroud	Development of a process is a good approach.
2-1	comment card	River Islands @ Lathrop, Glenn Gebharett	Make models available to the public.
2-2	comment card	River Islands @ Lathrop, Glenn Gebharett	Consider using the River Islands project as an example of how to use the guiding principles.
3-1	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Include full descriptions of the models.
3-2	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Include an example evaluation of a project.
3-3	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Fully describe the database to support the models.
3-4	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Describe model validation studies.
3-5	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Fully describe modeling studies evaluating performance of potential improvements to the flood management system.
3-6	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Was a technical advisory committee involved in modeling?
3-7	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	Was there any peer review of the modeling work?
3-8	comment card	Romeo R. Favreau	There is no signature of a PE taking responsibility for work.
4-1	comment card	Colusa County, Supervisor William Waite	Restore capacity of weir system.
4-2	comment card	Colusa County, Supervisor William Waite	Build Sites dam for improved flood control.
4-3	comment card	Colusa County, Supervisor William Waite	Encourage construction of small reservoirs in the Colusa Basin.
5-1	comment card	Linda Howard	In interim, how do we maintain our levee system?
6-1	comment card	Colusa Basin Flood Control Dist., John Garner	Provide hydraulic modeling information about effect of vegetation in the bypass on flood risk.
7-1	comment card	Myers - Marsh Mutual Water Co., Joseph Marsh	Use offstream storage to reduce flows.
7-2	comment card	Myers-Marsh Mutual Water Co., Joseph Marsh	Agencies should manage rangelands in western Colusa County to reduce fire hazard.
7-3	comment card	Myers-Marsh Mutual Water Co., Joseph Marsh	Please listen to our community.
8-1	comment card	Tom Ellis	Please send notes from all meetings and the final report.
9-1	comment card	Tehama County Farm Bureau, Bob Williams	Dredging should be considered.
9-2	comment card	Tehama County Farm Bureau, Bob Williams	Economic impacts of converting agricultural land to habitat should be considered.
10-1	comment card	Deborah Lynn Gregory-Fisher	Will provide input on H2O test idea.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
11-1	comment card	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	The plan must not violate Congressional actions and intent nor SWRCB decisions on the Upper San Joaquin River.
12-1	comment card	Fresno County, Phil Desatoff	State more clearly that projects need local support.
13-1	comment card	Reclamation District 108, Jack Wallace	Enjoyed the meeting, esp. comments from the audience.
14-1	comment card	Robert N. Hennigan	How do we request information under FOIA?
15-1	comment card	Beverley Gordon	Do not set levees back.
16-1	comment card	Russell Young (farmer), Meridian, CA	The report leans heavily on protecting urban areas and addressing environmental concerns at the expense of rural stakeholders
16-2	comment card	Russell Young (farmer), Meridian, CA	Does not address the need for off-stream and on-stream storage
16-3	comment card	Russell Young (farmer), Meridian, CA	The plan doesn't address how stakeholders will be compensated for flooding of prime farm land
17-1	comment card	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Los Banos, CA, Kim Forrest	The West Bear Creek IP accomplished both flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration and should be implemented as a multi-purpose project under the Comp Study
18-1	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Supports the general objectives of the study.
18-2	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Report is much improved from the previous Master Plan approach.
18-3	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Need more comprehensive treatment of potential flood management measures, such as identification of choke points and channel conveyance.
18-4	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Need to evaluate projects in concert with tidal effects in the delta.
18-5	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Reoperation is over emphasized and may impact water supply, which should be protected with a G.P.
18-6	letter	Turlock Irrigation District, Robert M. Ness	Models should be more fully shared.
19-1	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	The plan is an important step toward recognition of the Central Valley as an ecosystem.
19-2	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Maintain the linkage of flood control and ecosystem restoration.
19-3	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Retain all 6 planning objectives and require that all projects incorporate them.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
19-4	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Retain the 10 GP's and require that projects follow them.
19-5	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Add a new GP on restoration of a riparian corridor.
19-6	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Add a new GP on restoration of river channel meandering.
19-7	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Add a more complete description of an effective adaptive management and monitoring program.
19-8	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Add a clear requirement that the Corps and Reclamation Board move system-wide and regional projects forward.
19-9	letter	Environmental Council of Sacramento, David J. Mogavero	Add mechanism for ensuring a strong ecosystem restoration component, so that restoration objectives are met concurrently with flood damage reduction objectives.
20-1	letter	Delta Protection Commission, Margit Aramburu	Proposed measures for the Yolo Bypass appear to be in conflict. Need a planning lead and funding.
20-2	letter	Delta Protection Commission, Margit Aramburu	Proposed measures for the lower SJR appear to impact Delta agriculture. Need a planning lead and funding.
20-3	letter	Delta Protection Commission, Margit Aramburu	Seek input on problems from landowners in the Yolo Bypass during development of any projects in that area.
20-4	letter	Delta Protection Commission, Margit Aramburu	Need to address timing and duration of flows in bypass in terms of impact on viability of agriculture.
20-5	letter	Delta Protection Commission, Margit Aramburu	Future planning should make all efforts to maintain a vibrant agricultural economy in the Delta Primary Zone.
21-1	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	Owners need to be involved in any future flood control projects in the area.
21-2	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	Report places too much emphasis on ecosystem restoration compared to the low priority for flood damage reduction in upper San Joaquin River area.
21-3	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	New flood control storage projects should be evaluated before any other projects because they provide flood protection and are necessary to provide water for ER.
21-4	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	Implementation plan must recognize that flood protection takes priority over ecosystem restoration.
21-5	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	How will landowner rights be protected?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
21-6	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	How will flood management vs. management of the ecosystem be managed?
21-7	letter	San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors Water Authority, Steve Chedester	How will agricultural interests be protected against urban interests?
22-1	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Comp Study should include the Delta as a solution area, perhaps avoiding some storage needs
22-2	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Vision should be revised to indicate that "safe from flooding" cannot be assured
22-3	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	It is inappropriate for a "guiding principle" to require that a flood control project "promote" agriculture and open space
22-4	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Rec Board should not expand its focus beyond flood control. Other agencies deal with land planning and ecosystem issues.
22-5	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Comp Study requires enlarging Rec Board budget and staff
22-6	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report needs to clarify and expand the discussion of differences between the two rivers and their floodplains
22-7-a	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Historically, Sac River floodplains did not provide spawning and rearing habitat for native fishes
22-7-b	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Need better description of Sac River overflow areas and how & when they function
22-8-a	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	"Conditions Today" in report should explain that project levees were built with Federal funds and maintenance responsibility turned over to State, which delegated it to local districts
22-8-b	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Original maintenance requirements did not anticipate impacts of environmental protection regulations
22-9	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	P. 17, insert "reasonably" before "safe from flooding"
22-10	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report should explain loss of conveyance capacity due to channel aggradation and vegetative growth
22-11	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report should assure that conveyance capacity is not lost due to habitat development and maintenance

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
22-12	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report should explain that along the Sac River floodplain storage would need to be pumped out instead of naturally draining
22-13	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Comp Study should investigate increasing flood flows to the Delta that could avoid upstream levee failures
22-14	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Benefit-cost analysis should consider the whole system and rather than increments
22-15	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	There is a serious imbalance between benefits and costs incurred by local levee maintenance districts, especially in downstream districts
22-16	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Need to develop means to maintain, protect, and improve levees in a manner compatible with environmental protection
22-17	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Need to develop a means to protect existing levees, where needed, in a manner which is environmentally acceptable.
22-18	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	References to "Sac bank" project are inconsistent with that project's authorization
22-19	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Affirmatively acting to create or promote wildlife-friendly ag practices should not be the purview of the Rec Board or other flood control agencies
22-20	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report should distinguish between levee maintenance and channel maintenance
22-21	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Some confusion over the use of "channel" versus "floodway" (pg 50, 1st bullet)
22-22	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Concur with suggested expansion of multi-purpose O&M funding when benefits occur to other areas
22-23	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Map on page 53 should clearly identify area of Delta excluded from Comp Study
22-24	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Concur with increasing storage at Shasta Reservoir
22-25	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Establishing a "meander zone" will still require an environmentally acceptable means of confining the river to that "zone"
22-26	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	There are no "flood relief structures" controlling the flow of flood water into the upper Butte Basin

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
22-27	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	The report incorrectly states that floodwater leaving the Sac River later returned to the river farther downstream. Historically, much of this water evaporated or percolated, and never returned to the river.
22-28	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Report needs clarification on the Colusa Basin Drain, P. 57.
22-29	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	The Association does not assert that native habitat is fundamentally incompatible with flood management, but is potentially incompatible if not controlled
22-30	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	The possibility that PL 84-99 will be cost-shared in the future is a serious threat to the viability of the system
22-31	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Periodic sediment removal to restore channel capacity is as justifiable as restoring natural habitat
22-32	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	The Association does not support setback levees in the Mid Sac R region, unless for better foundations
22-33	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Protecting hard points in a meander zone requires an environmentally acceptable means of erosion protection
22-34	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Water leaving the floodway via "backwater inflow" (pg 60) may not return to the floodway by gravity along some reaches of the Sacramento River.
22-35	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Habitat on former ag lands will need to be managed to avoid adverse hydraulic impacts (pg 62)
22-36	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Periodic sediment removal to restore channel capacity is as justifiable as restoring natural habitat
22-37	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Top of p. 65, must include some acceptable means of protecting levee banks when river reaches limit of zone
22-38	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Add "Natomas East Main Drainage Canal" to discussion at bottom of pg 65 on lower Sac R tributaries with flooding problems
22-39	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Add info on Colusa Basin Drain to 1st full sentence on pg 66
22-40	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	On pg 67, reference to the American River should be added to next to last paragraph

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
22-41	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Changes to Fremont Weir, Sac R Weir and Yolo Bypass capacity (pg 68) may result in acquiring new flowage easements from property owners
22-42	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	The Tule Canal could also be connected to the Colusa Basin Drain through the Knights Landing Ridge Cut to provide continuous downstream flows (may require fish screen)
22-43	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	On pg 69, "Little Egbert Tract" should either be "Little Hastings Tract" or "Egbert Tract"
22-44	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	Modifying levees on Little Hastings Tract would expose a portion of RD 2060 levee to direct flows of the bypass
22-45	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	On pg 70, "Sacramento Area Flood Control Association" should be "Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency"
22-46	letter	Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer, George Basye	On pg 77, second line of 1st bullet, "attenuate" should be "accommodate"
23-1	letter	Department of Pesticide Regulation, Paul Helliker	Supports the "Wildlife Friendly Agricultural Practices" that reduce pesticide runoff into surface waters.
24-1	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	The guiding principles are an important and meaningful first step.
24-2	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Strengthen the point that flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration are interdependent.
24-3	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Strengthen the role of planning objectives.
24-4	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Create a comprehensive system-wide plan.
24-5	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Designate the future flood carrying capacities in the two major river systems.
24-6	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Develop an outreach program.
24-7	email	Jane Brasuell-Wax	Improve the adaptive management component.
25-1	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Emphasis on ecosystem restoration and floodplain management is long overdue, and should be adhered to in implementing future projects
25-2	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Setback levees are inherently safer than levees close to a channel
25-3	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	More emphasis should be given to the increasing public recognition of the value of open space. The need for ecosystem restoration is becoming more critical in the Central Valley.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
25-4	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Guiding Principles should state that levee O&M should be consistent with the Plan's ecosystem restoration goals
25-5	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Inconsistencies between FEMA and Corps floodplains should be eliminated
25-6	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Because of the potential transfer of flood risk by local projects, it is important that comprehensive evaluations are conducted
25-7	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Pg 21 may understate the value of transitory storage. Urbanization results in more peaked flow hydrographs and transitory storage may mitigate for setback levees and ecosystem restoration
25-8	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Pg 23 correctly recognizes "residual risk"; the Frequency method (e.g., 1 % in a year) for describing performance is more meaningful than Return Period (100 year protection); areas protected by levees should still pay flood insurance based upon residual risk.
25-9	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Pgs 33-39 describes a fundamental change in the Rec Board's basic mission, which should be reflected in their Mission Statement and Authority
25-10	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Emphasis should be given to coordinating with the CALFED single blueprint for ecosystem restoration
25-11	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Future technical studies (pg 39) should begin ASAP, especially river geomorphology
25-12	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Should be greater emphasis on impacts of global climate change (pg 40)
25-13	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Monitoring and project performance measurement activities should be given high priority
25-14	letter	Rick Bettis, PE, Sacramento	Coordinated reservoir operation and anticipatory release analyses are important and should be emphasized
26-1	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Report gives impression that flood control is lower priority than restoration; restoration should be managed to not cause adverse flood flow Impacts in the future; local levee maintenance agencies should not pay for restoration management; restoration should be viewed on a comprehensive basis

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
26-2	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Environmental concerns should be limited to designated areas; restoring "natural floodplain" would move communities out of the valley
26-3	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	If flood control and saving agriculture must have restoration benefits, then restoration should have flood control and agricultural benefits
26-4	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Report pg 19 and comments at Rec Board meeting imply that Marysville/Yuba City are developing in unprotected floodplain and will be penalized by growth limits and setback levees to protect Sacramento
26-5	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Only solution in report for bad levee foundations is setback levees, all other options should be presented
26-6	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 20 states that hydraulic modeling shows that vegetation does not adversely impact flood stage; did this include un-maintained growth?
26-7	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Report should include review of potential new reservoirs, in addition to Sites
26-8	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Will a statewide or basin wide plan be developed to provide funding options for flood control and restoration?
26-9	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	The Comp Plan goal (or lack of) to restore historic conditions needs to be better described
26-10	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Converting ag to habitat hurts both local economy and food production, conflicts with ag/open space guiding principle
26-11	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Clarify why system-wide projects are limited to non-structural projects
26-12	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	When a regional project benefits an adjacent region, will the adjacent region be required to cost-share?
26-13	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	More confusion over whether or not pre-1850 conditions are being restored
26-14	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 44, Emergency Flood Fighting - It is not the intent of PL 84-99 to modify the system; emergency repairs should not be used to implement ecosystem restoration
26-15	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 47, Flood Hazard Mitigation - Why are the Corps & DWR proposing changes to FEMA's NFIP requirements?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
26-16	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 48, on establishing a higher minimum level of flood protection - Will local communities be expected to cost-share in projects to achieve a higher minimum level of protection?
26-17	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Use of ag lands for habitat buffers will require safe harbor plans
26-18	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 50, Env Sensitive Channel Maintenance - Gives the impression that restoration has a higher priority than public safety
26-19	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 50, All stakeholders should have input into any changes to O&M manuals
26-20	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 55, Reservoir Reoperation - Gives the impression that restoration is more important than public safety
26-21	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 58, Stakeholder Interest and Concerns - Appears to downplay stakeholder interest while glamorizing restoration efforts
26-22	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 59, Levee Maintenance Modifications - states that small-stem diameter willows could be established on levees. Do they stay small-stemmed? Will undergrowth be maintained?
26-23	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 59, define meander zone; will levees be removed? Do stakeholders have input?
26-24	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 59, Are there options for fixing existing levees other than levee strengthening?
26-25	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 61, Yuba City area has more than 50,000 residents
26-26	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	System-wide options need to look closely at the relationship between the lower Feather River and the middle and lower Sacramento River basins
26-27	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Why is urban development an issue in the Feather River region (where none is occurring) and there is no mention of it as an issue in the Natomas area of Sacramento?
26-28	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 62, The Comp Plan needs to consider options to make up the storage area lost when a planned reservoir (i.e. Marysville Lake) was never built.
26-29	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 64, Who would be responsible for maintaining restored riparian habitat?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
26-30	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 65, What are the meander zone limits?
26-31	letter	Sutter County Public Works Dept, Mary Keller, Dep Dir Water Resources	Pg 65, Will a regional plan be implemented to correct the problem of the levee system to upstream communities being flooded as the flows can not reach the Sacramento River as they historically did?
27-1	letter	CAL TRANS, Wm. Costa	We understand that, based upon our previous comments, a new Guiding Principle will added to the Plan that includes transportation and is to be titled "Infrastructure"
27-2	letter	CAL TRANS, Wm. Costa	The Comp Study appears to have it's major focus on Ecosystem Enhancement and Riparian Habitat Restoration
27-3	letter	CAL TRANS, Wm. Costa	Future projects will need to be reviewed on a case by case basis to evaluate a vast array of potential impacts to transportation corridors. Examples of issues to be evaluated are given.
28-1	email	Butte Environmental Council, Barbara Vlamis	The guiding principles are valuable.
28-2	email	Butte Environmental Council, Barbara Vlamis	Strengthen the point that FDR and ER are interdependent.
28-3	email	Butte Environmental Council, Barbara Vlamis	Strengthen the role of the planning objectives.
28-4	email	Butte Environmental Council, Barbara Vlamis	Create a comprehensive system-wide plan.
28-5	email	Butte Environmental Council, Barbara Vlamis	Improve the adaptive management component.
29-1	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	Which "institutional problems must be addressed", who will address them, and when?
29-2	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	When will referenced additional studies (geomorphic, geotech, river meander, etc.) be completed and who will pay?
29-3	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	At which "specific locations" was EFM applied and who was involved?
29-4	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	Rather than have the Rec. Board in charge of implementation, use the same team approach as was used to develop the plan.
29-5	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	What is the anticipated funding source for this program?
29-6	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	Clarify contradictory statements regarding stakeholder support.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
29-7	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	The comprehensive treatment of issues has been compromised, thereby jeopardizing public safety for political expediency.
29-8	email	Sacramento River Preservation Trust, John Merz	What's next, i.e., response to comments, additional review, and final report?
30-1	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	The guiding principles are an important and meaningful first step.
30-2	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Strengthen the point that FDR and ER are interdependent.
30-3	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Strengthen the role of the planning objectives.
30-4	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Create a comprehensive system-wide plan.
30-5	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Designate the future flood carrying capacities in the two major river systems.
30-6	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Develop an outreach program.
30-7	letter	San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center, Lydia Miller; and Protect Our Water, Steve Burke	Improve the adaptive management component.
31-1	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	The underlying strategy of addressing issues on a system-wide basis is excellent.
31-2	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Balancing flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration is the right approach.
31-3	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	System-wide approach is supported, but the system should include the Delta.
31-4	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Ensure compatibility with the goals and objectives of the San Francisco Estuary CCMP, prepared in 1993.
31-5	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	The Comprehensive Study should ensure there are no negative impacts to downstream areas, i.e. San Francisco Bay Estuary.
31-6	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Study needs to analyze the effects of enhancing geomorphic processes on the transportation of silt downstream to the San Francisco Bay Estuary.
31-7	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Is there enough water for all needs, including a healthy and sufficient flow of water through the delta to the Bay/Estuary?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
31-8	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Comprehensive plan should be integrated with San Francisco Bay Estuary CCMP.
31-9	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Report should clarify the status of the scientific and expert panel review of the evaluation tools and ensure that this panel has proper composition and that this step has a high priority.
31-10	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Since implementation of many small projects is envisioned, operating principles must include the study of impacts on the San Francisco Bay Estuary
31-11	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	The principle of avoiding hydraulic and hydrologic impacts should also apply to areas outside of the study area also, including the Bay. Also explain why the Bay is not included in the study area.
31-12	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Does the Rec Board have the staffing and funding to ensure protection for all downstream interests?
31-13	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Will monitoring and assessment for adaptive management include the Bay? What will be done if project impacts are found?
31-14	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Impacts of increased flood stages downstream from the project area should also include the San Francisco Bay.
31-15	letter	Friends of the Estuary, William Tuohy	Comment period is too short; request an extension.
32-1	letter	Contra Costa Water District, Richard A. Denton	Outreach does not appear to include areas with redirected impacts, e.g., the Delta.
32-2	letter	Contra Costa Water District, Richard A. Denton	Consider the potential impacts of flood control and ecosystem restoration on water quality in the Delta.
32-3	letter	Contra Costa Water District, Richard A. Denton	Consider potential impacts on all CALFED program goals.
33-1	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The goals of the Comprehensive Study, flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, are critically important to the Central Valley and must be met to sustain and improve the health and productivity of its human, plant and wildlife communities.
33-2	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Agree that FDR and ER need to be integrated into the same solution.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
33-3	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Traditional flood control measures have contributed significantly to the declining health of the Valley's ecosystems and have proven to be unreliable in large flood events.
33-4	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The best flood management measures recognize the vital function of the floodplain, protect people, contribute to the improvement of ecosystem health, and allow the continuation of compatible land uses.
33-5	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Report sets the stage for development of effective flood management and ecosystem projects through use of guiding principles.
33-6	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Plan falls short of meeting the needs for a system-wide plan by allowing piecemeal implementation without sufficient guidance on the system-wide needs.
33-7	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Maintain and expand upon the linkage between flood control and ecosystem restoration to produce sustainable and effective projects. Give priority to measures that contribute to this linkage.
33-8	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The plan must retain and strengthen the guiding principles.
33-9	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The Rec. Board must ensure that future projects achieve the detailed performance measures within the planning objectives.
33-10	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Provide details on how the Rec. Board will incorporate the principles and objectives into their decision-making process.
33-11	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The report lacks an effective implementation plan. The processes for obtaining approval of a project must be clear and understandable to the public.
33-12	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Provide an effective mechanism for ensuring a strong ecosystem restoration component will be incorporated into future projects. Establish an evaluation process that includes a science review panel to determine ecosystem benefits.
33-13	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Maintain commitment to achieve CALFED goals and provide details on plans to coordinate with CALFED. Some suggestions are provided.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
33-14	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Technical evaluations and models developed by the Comp Study must be readily available for use by the public for developing multiple benefit projects.
33-15	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	System-wide projects should be further studied and implemented as appropriate.
33-16	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The plan has not adequately addressed challenges related to future population growth. The concepts described in the potential system-wide project for floodplain management should be woven into the rest of the document.
33-17	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The measures described under the regional descriptions seem to capture the intent of the guiding principles and planning objectives.
33-18	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The plan must provide details on implementation to ensure development of system-wide and regional projects in a timely manner.
33-19	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. S-2: Include full text of the GP's in the summary, or at least state that the description is a summary.
33-20	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. S-3: Where in the plan is the "basic direction" for projects defined, and who will do the system-wide assessment?
33-21	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. S-4 and 36: Where is the strategy for initiating and sequencing projects described?
33-22	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 1: What is the source of the chart "Flood damages caused by recent flood events."
33-23	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 4: It is not accurate to state that stakeholders do not want a "system-wide physical project" because (implied) they were not sure how future projects would be developed.
33-24	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 8: State the volume of water delivered annually by SWP, similar to statement for CVP.
33-25	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 19: The importance of assuring that changes in an area do not transfer problems to other areas applies to ecosystem problems also.
33-26	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	p. 19: Include the technical information used to support statement that system-wide levee modifications would not provide enough flood water storage. How much would it provide?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
33-27	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	p. 21: Include information used to analyze impacts to Delta levees from increased flows.
33-28	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 24: Why are CALFED's restoration goals identified as opposed to the objectives of the Comprehensive Study?
33-29	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 25: In last bullet change "maintenance" to "restoration".
33-30	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Add GP on channel meander zone.
33-31	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Add GP on habitat corridor.
33-32	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Add to GP #5: "Modifications to conveyance capacities will include in their designs adequate capacity to accommodate the restoration of natural processes and growth of native vegetation along the channel."
33-33	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Modify GP #7: "Future projects will consider the needs of native aquatic, wetland, and terrestrial communities, and whenever possible, improve their potential for long-term survival . . .
33-34	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Add to GP #10: "Funding priority will be given to projects with multiple benefits when the Reclamation Board is the project sponsor."
33-35	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 32: Approach for Developing Projects does not describe an approach. The three levels are not new. The approach, at a minimum, should address how the evaluation of system-wide effects would be done.
33-36	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 33: In list of task for Rec. Board, clarify for which projects they will perform these tasks.
33-37	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Adaptive Assessment and Management requires more than "routine" monitoring and evaluation of actions. "Careful, selective monitoring and research" is more appropriate.
33-38	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Will existing authorities allow the Rec Board to sponsor projects that are primarily ER with secondary FDR benefits?
33-39	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 37: First bullet under Implementation seems to suggest modifying the analysis to ensure Federal participation. Clarify problem and the identified solution.
33-40	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 37: Second bullet under Implementation says that benefits are watershed-wide but costs are borne by those adjacent to facilities. Clarify what benefits are included.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
33-41	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	The adaptive assessment and management section lacks sufficient detail to determine whether an effective program will be implemented.
33-42	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Coordination with CALFED needs to occur at the project level and at a higher level to address broader issues.
33-43	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Most of the "Future Technical Studies" should be performed by the Corps and Rec Board, rather than by projects.
33-44	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 40: Measuring project performance. Develop specific targets for objectives to provide a foundation for developing and applying performance measures, or lay out a plan for developing a system-wide set of performance measures.
33-45	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Note that some objectives for reducing flooding should be pursued only where safety, property, and infrastructure are at risk.
33-46	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Reduction in frequency, depth, and duration of flooding is important for people, but the opposite is often desirable for the ecosystem.
33-47	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 42: Under Technical Review of Projects, discuss how system-wide ecosystem effects will be assessed, including how EFM will be used.
33-48	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Reviewers have not been given the opportunity to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the models.
33-49	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Explain how small projects will be assessed if models do not detect changes at their scale, how conflicts between models will be resolved, who will pay to run the system-wide models, and how mitigation requirements will be determined.
33-50	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	It is not clear why progress must occur in resolving water supply issues before flood management projects can proceed.
33-51	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	Please explain how new restoration efforts could further compromise needed maintenance of the flood management system.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
33-52	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 50, first bullet: change "preservation" to "restoration". Restoration of functioning ecosystems must plan for natural succession of vegetation and should not need "maintenance". Vegetation removal should be done by techniques that are compatible with the natural community.
33-53	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 52: Change first sentence of second para. To "Currently there is strong interest for planning and implementing new projects in some regions."
33-54	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 52: Statement is made that water supply studies must be completed before regional projects are identified. Water supply, FDR, and ER projects should occur in parallel.
33-55	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 55 and 58: Report should reflect that the SRCA forum is implementing Senate Bill 1086 and not just the group's "interest".
33-56	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 55: Correct reference for DWR's storage investigation is North of Delta Off-Stream Storage Investigation, not Sites Reservoir.
33-57	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 59 and 77: Sediment should be managed through periodic high flows, and not dredging.
33-58	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 75: Under stakeholder Interests and Concerns, acknowledge that ER benefits could be achieved through reservoir reoperation.
33-59	letter	The Nature Conservancy, Michael Sweeney	P. 77: Add a meander zone measure to the lower San Joaquin potential measures section.
34-1	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	This Report needs to include a programmatic EIS/EIR, from which future project-specific documents would tier.
34-2	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	The Delta needs to be included in the Report's planning region. Calfed is doing only habitat restoration, with no public safety element in the Delta.
34-3	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Based on comments heard at the public meetings, there is consensus that the existing flood control system is a marvel that needs to be repaired, restored and maintained.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
34-4	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Redesigning and re-operating the system (setback levees) is not rational. Transitory storage - water won't simply flow back into an unleveed system when the flood peak has passed because the Sacramento River bed is at a higher elevation than surrounding basins.
34-5	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Report needs to emphasize that development should not occur on historic floodplain because levees will fail someday - the question is not if but when. Historic floodplains and basin should be maintained for agricultural use.
34-6	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	There has been no element of trust in this dialogue.
34-7	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	There's a disenchantment between the "governors" and the "governed".
34-8	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Stakeholder input has been ignored.
34-9	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Document is as responsive as could be to comments in 2001 given existing laws.
34-10	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	While urbanites downriver may buy into the duality concept of flood control and ecosystem restoration, those who have/share control of the assets to achieve it do not buy into it.
34-11	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	The team did not understand at first the public's perception of laws such as ESA, and a shift in understanding was evident by saying that such policy issues would be included in the Report.
34-12	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	The document does not show a lot of bang for the buck. At the Rec Board meeting (8/16), "security concerns" was not mentioned, and full disclosure of the models was recommended.
34-13	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	With the Rec. Board staff of three, not much will be done to achieve early resolution of problems as projects come to the Rec. Board. Some of the 30 million should have been saved for this purpose.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
34-14	letter	California Farm Bureau Federation, Henry E. Rodegerdts	Stakeholder views are not reflected by the Report. There should be a delay until the Friant outcome is known. The outreach effort has been good in the San Joaquin, and should be modeled in the Sacramento. Comments should be scrutinized and incorporated, and it should be open for more comment before the final Report.
35-1	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Report fails to provide information on selecting types of restoration, flood control system, locations of inadequate conveyance capacity, areas that are critical to ecosystem restoration, cost factors, and funding sources for construction and maintenance.
35-2	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Report fails to provide any reference data by which basic needs of the flood control system were evaluated
35-3	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Report should indicate that 85% of the project levee system is maintained by local interests at local cost
35-4	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Legislation should be enacted to prevent high populations areas from fortifying their flood control system at the expense of flood protection in rural areas
35-5	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	The flood management system was originally designed to reduce flooding to reclaim land for development. The system is now used for recreation, ecosystem restoration, and water supply conveyance. Those who now receive these latter benefits do not contribute to the operation and maintenance of the system.
35-6	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	The Rec Board has in the past allowed encroachments that increase upstream flooding. There should be some type of oversight to assure that future system modifications do not increase upstream flood stages.
35-7	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Ecosystem restoration may reduce the market value of adjacent property, potentially creating an inverse condemnation situation
35-8	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Report fails to establish that all segments of the flood management system will be treated equally. Rural areas may not be able to afford cost-sharing and future O&M requirements.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
35-9	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Local levee maintenance agencies are responsible for protecting public facilities that do not contribute to the cost of maintenance. This additional cost is transferred to local property owners.
35-10	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Local levee maintenance agencies are liable for the performance of the portion of the system they maintain. This liability continues even when the performance of the system is adversely affected by public agencies over which they have no control.
35-11	letter	Reclamation District 1001, Donald E. White, Mgr	Report fails to discuss that the levee system was designed to carry high flows through the system for a short period of time. The present practice of sending high water supply flows down the river for long periods of time reduces the stability and reliability of the levees.
36-1	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	What accounted for the changes between the June 17, 2002 draft report and the July 22, 2002 interim report?
36-2	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	The primary emphasis of the report is geared towards ecosystem restoration, with secondary emphasis on flood damage reduction. A goal for ecosystem restoration needs to be established. The purpose of the flood management system in both river basins focused on protecting lives and property by increasing conveyance of floodwaters through the system.
36-3	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	Please explain the exact ecosystem objective of the Comp Plan
36-4	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	In discussing floodplain management, the report fails to recognize that most of the land within the floodplain is private property that has been protected by the current system for many years. The Plan also fails to address possible mitigation features for using private land as a flood control feature.
36-5	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	The Guiding Principles suggest agriculture and open space can be exposed to occasional flooding. Potential mitigation measures should be addressed in an equitable way to the land owner

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
36-6	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	Risk based flood mapping is geared toward putting more land in a regulated floodway and limiting agricultural operators choices of commodities available to them.
36-7	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	If economic justification by the Federal government potentially limits solutions, doesn't the State's economic justification also limit solutions?
36-8	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	Five of the nine potential measures indentified in the report under the description of the upper San Joaquin River region have not been proposed by any local constituencies
36-9	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	The public doesn't have access to the Comp Study's flood model
36-10	letter	Madera Co Farm Bureau, Jason Baldwin, Ex Dir	Please make the next draft report available for public review before finalizing the document
37-1	letter	County of Tehama, Department of Public Works, Ernie Ohlin	Pg. 12 does not reflect the 2 federal project levees in Tehama County on Deer Creek and Elder Creek.
37-2	letter	County of Tehama, Department of Public Works, Ernie Ohlin	Pg. 14 does not mention the 20 bank slope protection totally over 67,000 lineal feet in Tehama County.
37-3	letter	County of Tehama, Department of Public Works, Ernie Ohlin	Aerial photos of 1983 or 1997 should be viewed - they will show that tributary stream investigations should be a part of this report.
37-4	letter	County of Tehama, Department of Public Works, Ernie Ohlin	P. 37 maintenance costs statement deserves much discussion and consideration.
38-1	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	The Report is geared toward ecosystem restoration, with flood damage reduction as a secondary goal.
38-2	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	A goal for ecosystem restoration needs to be established. The ability to "restore" an ecosystem to an unidentified point in time is limited, at best.
38-3	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	We must remember why the systems were developed and recognize that the riverine systems are highly developed.
38-4	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Too much emphasis on non-structural measures.
38-5	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Fails to recognize that much of the land in the floodplain is private property and possible mitigation features need to be addressed.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
38-6	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Guiding Principle #2 should be removed, and the rest should be publicly workshopped to define a fair and structured way of applying them. There's currently no indication as to how they will be applied, how they will be weighted, and who will make decisions.
38-7	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Implementation bullet #1: Saying that B/C justification limits solutions leads to support Rec. Board authority to do ecosystem restoration and is untrue.
38-8	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Cost sharing by all landowners is controversial and needs more conversation if this concept is to move forward.
38-9	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Implementation issues need to be reviewed through a much more thorough process, and the Rec. Board should leave ecosystem restoration activities to the agencies currently authorized.
38-10	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Some measures mentioned here were not proposed by local constituents, and some were adamantly opposed by locals.
38-11	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	The public does not have access to the groundbreaking information in the models.
38-12	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	The Study failed to look at flood control technologies available and how ecosystem restoration could fit in. Instead, it focuses on ecosystem restoration and how flood control could fit in.
38-13	letter	Fresno County Farm Bureau, Karla Kay Fullerton	Substantial change needs to be made (see comment #12), and document needs to go back out for public comment.
39-1	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill (NOTE: in some of these comments, information from the June 17th draft report is attributed to the July 22nd report)	Regulatory requirements placed after District responsibilities were established have strained the technical and financial resources of the District. Since this is a State facility to be maintained to State standards, there should be State technical assistance to meet new, expanded responsibilities that exceed staff capabilities.
39-2	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Benefits from the project are system-wide, but translating that to system-wide fiscal support while retaining necessary local autonomy is challenging.
39-3	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The potential for ecosystem restoration in rural areas is limited because the land is fully utilized by agriculture.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
39-4	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The report implies that the NRDC/FWUA effort is a component of the Comp Study, which it is not
39-5	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Pg 28 - Don't just recognize public safety, make it a priority
39-6	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Education & communication are vital to promote understanding that rivers always pose risks
39-7	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Recommend that floodplain management goals be achieved through cooperative programs rather than regulation
39-8	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The approach that ag land is best suited for flood overflow and should be kept from development is an environmental perspective and not a flood damage reduction or landowner perspective
39-9	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Channel capacities must be maintained continuously throughout the ecosystem restoration process, rather than relying on modeling to predict future capacity with restoration. Modeling in this instance is not a substitute for local maintenance.
39-10	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Habitat restoration should not adversely affect the project's present level of performance
39-11	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Flooding of public land will only occur to the extent it furthers the purpose of the public land. It is, therefore, a habitat restoration driven approach, rather than a flood damage reduction approach.
39-12	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Local water districts are willing to accept and convey floodwaters in their facilities, except that the Bu of Reclamation counts that water against their annual water supply allocation
39-13	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The goals of CALFED and other regional programs should be described in detail to understand how they relate to the Comp Plan
39-14	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	More detail is needed on who develops criteria for a new structure for the Rec Board to administer future projects
39-15	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Adding new purposes to the Rec Board would be detrimental to its present flood control purpose

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
39-16	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Regarding Financing (pg 43), implies that only those areas that can provide their own project funding will get projects. Does this mean that less affluent areas will get damaged by those area's that can afford their own projects?
39-17	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Emergency flood fighting work should not have after the fact habitat restoration mitigation
39-18	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	There needs to be a process for resolving conflicts between maintenance requirements for existing projects and implementing contradictory regulations
39-19	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Maintenance agencies should receive mitigation credit for voluntary actions that benefit habitat
39-20	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Same as # 18 above
39-21	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The bypass system in the upper San Joaquin River functions as it was designed, contrary to a statement in the report
39-22	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The right bank - left bank levees in the Eastside Bypass from the Mariposa Bypass downstream to the confluence with the San Joaquin River were constructed at different times and are different elevations. In many places the left bank levee is up to two feet lower than the right bank levee. This was reported to the State at the time of construction, but never corrected.
39-23	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Clarify what reaches of the San Joaquin River are dry most of the year
39-24	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Use of the term stakeholder is controversial. Shouldn't those living in the area directly affected by an action have more weight than those interests that don't?
39-25	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	A coordinated reservoir re-operation analysis is a good idea, but more detail is needed on how control points would be selected and what the impact areas would be.
39-26	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Increasing the allocation of reservoir flood control storage and revising operation criteria could reduce flood flows without added capitol costs
39-27	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	All of the transitory storage locations in the upper San Joaquin River regional description have not been reviewed by landowners. Why identify specific locations?

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
39-28	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Previously the Comp Study alluded to increasing design flows in San Joaquin River downstream of the Bifurcation Structure to the 6,000-20,000 cfs range. While increasing channel capacity would be good, there are many local and downstream issues that would need to be addressed.
39-29	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	With improved foundations and a clear channel, the present levee alignments provide the designated channel capacity on the upper San Joaquin River. Providing a wider channel would only be for the purpose of promoting ecosystem restoration.
39-30	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	All levees along the upper San Joaquin River from the Bifurcation Structure downstream to the Mariposa Bypass are privately owned and maintained. Considering a wider floodway in this reach needs to recognize and address the potential adverse impacts to affected property owners.
39-31	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	Previous Comp Study reports implied that a ring levee could be constructed to protect the city of Firebaugh. Discussions with some Firebaugh residents does not indicate this is an appreciable alternative.
39-32	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The San Joaquin River is erosive, sediment deposition is an ongoing issue, and channel excavation is needed to reduce constrictions. Bridges need widened. Flushing sediment downstream only transfers the problem to someone else.
39-33	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The West Bear Creek Floodplain Re-connection project does not provide any significant downstream flood damage reduction benefits. Stating that peak flow is diverted is misleading. There are unresolved issues with this proposal that are not mentioned.
39-34	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The report does not provide a basic understanding of the unique distinctions between the two mainstem rivers
39-35	letter	Lower San Joaquin Levee District, Reggie N. Hill	The report places more consideration on ecosystem restoration than on flood damage reduction
40-1	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	The 6/17 and 7/22 versions are 2 totally separate drafts, which calls into question the intent of the Comp. Study. Stakeholder sentiments were not included.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
40-2	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	There was insufficient time for public review - only 8 days between release and first public meeting.
40-3	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	Pg. S-1: makes it sound like overpopulation is the problem, when in fact it is a lack of maintenance due to environmental restrictions.
40-4	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 19 (6/17 draft?): allowing levees to break upstream to protect downstream areas is outrageous.
40-5	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. S-3: The public wants a guarantee of structural fixes. Otherwise, why would the Sacramento area levees be structurally fixed?
40-6	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. S-4: Calfed ERP goals are not compatible with flood control. The Study has changed from what was authorized (flood control and environmental restoration) to flood management and ecosystem restoration.
40-7	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 2: What is the base for historical wetland acreage numbers? Where is it proven that the Sacramento River Basin is such an ecological disaster to warrant sacrificing flood control?
40-8	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 6: You mention negative aspects of piecemeal flood protection, but do not mention negative aspects of piecemeal ecosystem restoration.
40-9	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 10: Agriculture also serves as our nation's second line of defense, and ag land cannot become transitory storage, risking its productivity.
40-10	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 14: Grants for ecosystem restoration are making the system more clogged with vegetation, and it is only because of local outcries that some clearing has been done, but clearing is still insufficient for designed flood flows.
40-11	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 14: Dredging, an original design maintenance standard, needs to be allowed. Sac Bank is not aggressively used and is succumbing to environmental restrictions.
40-12	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 15: Ecosystem restoration work is not small in terms of projects or dollars.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
40-13	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 16: The commentary on smart/no growth, marginal ag land, and willing sellers erodes trust of the public. These are conditions created by the green industry.
40-14	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 20: Local choke points. How can this be a solution when agencies have forbidden the practice of cleaning them out due to environmental restrictions?
40-15	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 23 & 24: A directive of balance and practical solutions is needed - after 5 years and \$30 million we don't know much more than when we started.
40-16	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 27: The Rec. Board and the Corps need to be flexible - lack of flexibility, as seen in Hamilton City, raises concerns.
40-17	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	Guiding Principles, paragraph 1: Ongoing ecosystem restoration should provide the mitigation for flood control projects.
40-18	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 28, paragraph 2: It could also be said that cumulative impacts of ecosystem restoration have negatively impacted the flood control system.
40-19	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP #1: Happy to see that public safety was recognized first and foremost.
40-20	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP #2: What does this mean? It sounds like creating willing sellers out of farmers.
40-21	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP #3: What protections do farmers have that land will be dry in time for planting - if not, will they be compensated? Where's the mitigation bank for the landowners and farmers?
40-22	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP #5: This is just more restrictive environmental agenda.
40-23	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP#6: Now, maintenance of sediment deposits is non-existent. It states moving sediment through system will balance erosion and support dynamic habitat change, and a healthy ecosystem.
40-24	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP#7: Using an approach that is a restrictively ecosystem approach, this is not what the citizens want.
40-25	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP#8: This is a substantial goal. Is the Study showing a bias against new storage? Storage is a major solution component.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
40-26	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP#9: Calfed has goals that are incompatible with flood control, and currently Calfed is in litigation because of its guiding principles.
40-27	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	GP#10: This is a responsible goal, and so we should see flood control projects, like Auburn Dam in the final document.
40-28	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 36: The Reclamation Board should not have authority to do ecosystem restoration. It would throw off the checks and balances of the system.
40-29	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 44: Interim System Needs: Ecosystem restoration should not be part of emergency work. Comp. Study should not supprt mitigation costs for emergency fixes.
40-30	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 55 & 56: Potential measures: These measures have been opposed by locals - why did the Comp. Study include them in the Study?
40-31	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 58: Stakeholder issues don't tell the whole story and are followed by dismissive statements.
40-32	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 59: If sediment can be removed once, why not do it as necessary?
40-33	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 47: Where is the verbage for landowner mitigation monies?
40-34	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 48: Wildlife Friendly Agriculture - Why is agriculture being told to be compatible with wildlife? This is why farmers are telling you to leave them alone.
40-35	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	P. 49: System-wide reservoir re-op - where is the mention of new storage? If the Comp. Study were objectively looking at all options, new storage would be a component of the Study.
40-36	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	Organizational Structure - there are several problems here, including Calfed litigation, mitigation fund for landowners, Rec. Board responsibilities, and Safe Harbor issues.
40-37	letter	California State Senate, Senator K. Maurice Johannessen	This draft version is not acceptable - P. 19 is an example that the 2 versions of the document are smoke and mirrors.
41-1	letter	Contra Costa Co Flood Control & Water Conservation District, R.Mitch Avalon, Dep Ch Engr	Clarify the Comp Study boundary in Contra Costa County

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
41-2	letter	Contra Costa Co Flood Control & Water Conservation District, R.Mitch Avalon, Dep Ch Engr	Modifying sediment transport may exacerbate problems already occurring with silt deposition in the Delta, lower Sacramento River, and Suisun Bay, as well as the lower reaches of tidally influenced tributaries. How will the Comp Study preclude this type of redirected impact?
41-3	letter	Contra Costa Co Flood Control & Water Conservation District, R.Mitch Avalon, Dep Ch Engr	Increased flood flows from the study area will potentially impact Suisun, San Pablo, and San Francisco Bays, in addition to the Delta, and should be reflected in the report.
41-4	letter	Contra Costa Co Flood Control & Water Conservation District, R.Mitch Avalon, Dep Ch Engr	Any future proposals to increase flood flows in Old River need to consider impacts to downstream communities along Old River in Contra Costa Co that could be potentially impacted. Please include this agency as a stakeholder in any future studies of the lower San Joaquin River region.
42-1	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The guiding principles are a good first step to achieving reduced flood damages and an improved riparian ecosystem.
42-2	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The Comp Plan and guiding principles will not be effectively applied without being formally adopted by the Rec Board as a planning document
42-3	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The Plan leaves project development to be initiated by local interests and stakeholders, which is both a strength & a weakness. While it will improve acceptance, it may be beyond the capabilities of local interests to develop a multi-faceted project.
42-4	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The Plan allows piecemeal project development, a decided weakness. This could be improved by establishing target flood conveyance capacities on all reaches in the system. This would allow other interests to effectively plan system compatible projects.
42-5	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	There should be a comprehensive, continuing outreach program to teach the public, developers, landowners, etc about rivers, flooding, and residual risk.
42-6	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The State should be more active in protecting the floodplain from development. Revegetation should not be scrutinized.
42-7	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Explain how evaluations of cumulative hydraulic impacts will be conducted

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
42-8	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Explain how local projects will be designed to allow for system-wide sediment continuity.
42-9	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Will there be a requirement to develop all projects (both FDR & ER) using an ecosystem approach (GP #7)?
42-10	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Who will undertake studies and implement findings to optimize use of existing facilities? It will likely require State or Federal, rather than local, leadership.
42-11	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	How will CALFED be accomplished at the institutional level? Will Comp Plan ecosystem restoration projects be subject to the CALFED ERP project selection process? Will flood control become another CALFED program?
42-12	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Promoting multi-purpose projects is a good guiding principle.
42-13	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The responsibilities of the Organizational Structure (pg 33) may exceed the capabilities of the Rec Board's official staff of 3. How will the Rec Board's authority allow it to oversee ecosystem restoration projects? The Board's authority and budget may have to be expanded.
42-14	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Creating regional stakeholder groups to hold more meetings for public engagement and problem solving is not a good idea. Alternatively, this should be accomplished through existing programs such as SJRMP and SRCAF.
42-15	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	The Budget item on pg 33 suggests that budgets be submitted to the State legislature for projects to be implemented under the Comp Plan. How will projects be classified as a project of the Comp Plan? Will any projects be implemented outside of the Comp Plan?
42-16	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	What is the Rec Board's authority for ecosystem restoration?
42-17	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Clarify the issue regarding justifying Federal participation on pg 37. It reads as if benefits would be overstated for the sake of justifying Federal cost-sharing.
42-18	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Project budgets need to have sufficient funds to support effective adaptive assessment and monitoring

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
42-19	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Current Corps policy prohibiting use of Federal funds to acquire land should be changed to facilitate increased opportunities for flood damage and ecosystem restoration.
42-20	letter	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust, Patrick Koepele	Without formal adoption by the Rec Board, the Plan has no weight. This would require CEQA compliance.
43-1	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Most overriding concern is a bias against the use of surface storage for flood control and not recognizing the need for more water supply on the east side of the San Joaquin River valley.
43-2	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Comp Study planning is based upon a flawed determination of the 100-year event.
43-3	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Concerned about the emphasis on promoting the occasional flooding of agricultural land
43-4	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Pg 11, 2nd bullet indicates a lack of coordination between Comp Study and FEMA
43-5	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	It is unlikely that the EFM can model the "dewatered" conditions of the upper San Joaquin River
43-6	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	The Plan needs to be more clear in how the Guiding Principles will be used
43-7	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	The Guiding Principle on promoting agriculture should recognize agriculture for all of its values, not just as a buffer against urban flooding
43-8	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	The Guiding Principle on system conveyance capacity should not preclude new reservoirs as part of flood management
43-9	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Regarding the ecosystem approach guiding principle, sound flood management decisions should not be compromised because not enough ecosystem restoration is being accomplished
43-10	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	The report does not describe an organizational structure. It is important to indicate who will be making decisions on the application of the Guiding Principles and what will be the avenue for appeals or means for resolving disagreements.
43-11	letter	Madera Irrigation District, Stephen H. Ottemoeller, GM	Request another public review of the document before it is finalized

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
44-1	e-mail	City of Lodi, Richard Prima, Public Works Director	The document barely mentions the Delta, and no mention is made of the Mokelumne or Calaveras Rivers. No meetings were held in this area either. Why?
45-1	letter	Environmental Water Caucus, David Nesmith, Facilitator	Strengthen the plan's linkage of flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration
45-2	letter	Environmental Water Caucus, David Nesmith, Facilitator	Create a comprehensive system-wide plan.
45-3	letter	Environmental Water Caucus, David Nesmith, Facilitator	Designation of systemwide flood carrying capacities
45-4	letter	Environmental Water Caucus, David Nesmith, Facilitator	Develop an outreach and education program.
45-5	letter	Environmental Water Caucus, David Nesmith, Facilitator	Improve the adaptive management component.
46-1	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Effective management of the Central Valley Rivers must address the existing inadequate level of flood protection and ecosystem problems.
46-2	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Although the document fails to provide a fully integrated program, it is an important first step.
46-3	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	The Report falls short of a system-wide Plan. Specifically, the report needs to provide guidance on future system-wide capacities.
46-4	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Report needs to underscore the benefits of integrating Flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration objectives.
46-5	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Outreach efforts have failed to underscore the benefits of integrating Flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration objectives.
46-6	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Need to retain guiding principles that were added and improved on earlier versions. Need to add clarity on Rec. Board's incorporation of Principles and Objectives into their decision-making process.
46-7	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	The Report needs to include development of an outreach and education program. Past failures to have a consistent message have bred mistrust.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
46-8	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	The Implementation Planning Strategy is vague - the Report needs to include a process framework describing how projects will be assessed.
46-9	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	The Report does not indicate how this effort will be integrated with Calfed.
46-10	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	The statement that flood flows in the lower San Joaquin are unaffected by improvements made in the Upper San Joaquin is false and needs to be changed. The Upper San Joaquin Region section needs to be revised to indicate the need for a system-wide approach on the San Joaquin to ensure projects comply with the Guiding Principles.
46-11	letter	Natural Resources Defense Council, Monty Schmitt, Restoration Scientist	Potential measures needs to address the need to increase system capacities.
47-1	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	Stop Comp. Study activities on the San Joaquin at least until Friant decision is known.
47-2	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	The "Stakeholder Recommendations" report did not include stakeholder input from the Upper San Joaquin. Discard the document and start the process again.
47-3	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	The Report is geared toward ecosystem restoration. What about new storage for flood management and ecosystem restoration? Need to include input from stakeholders other than environmental interests in this report.
47-4	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	"Promote effective floodplain management" guiding principle should reflect that landowners must be compensated for the use of their land for floodplains.
47-5	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	The "promote agriculture and open space" guiding principle must reflect the productivity of agriculture and its economic contribution. It should also reflect that landowners must be compensated for the use of their land for floodplains.
47-6	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	"Optimize use of existing facilities" guiding principle constitutes a "taking" from those downstream for the benefit of ecosystem restoration. This principle must address the fact that new storage would not only aid in flood control, but would also provide additional water for many uses.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
47-7	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	Upper San Joaquin section "Stakeholder interests and concerns" must reflect that stakeholders want the Friant outcome known before any more studies and they want consideration of additional water storage.
47-8	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	Upper San Joaquin section "Potential measures - Increase Watershed Flood Damage Reduction Capabilities" must reflect the need for additional surface water storage. Title should read "Increase Watershed and Surface Water Storage Capability." The description should describe how this could effectively benefit all of us.
47-9	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	We do not support the report as currently written - you must make our changes to gain our endorsement.
47-10	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	We are outraged that flood management and public safety have taken a second seat to ecosystem restoration.
47-11	letter	Gravelly Ford Water District, Timothy Dasilva, President	Our lands are not for "taking" by any agency without appropriate compensation. We are long-term residents that will not give up our private property and water rights.
48-1	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	The Plan must be based on sound science and have mathematically accurate assumptions for legitimacy and public acceptance.
48-2	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	Some of the models are based on data that are widely disputed. If the Comp. Study is to have credibility, it must be based on sound data that is locally supportable.
48-3	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	The Comp. Study hit an impenetrable wall when the Rec. Board announced it was considering placing tens of thousands of acres of agricultural land under Title 23 control.
48-4	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	The intent of Title 23 was not to make the Rec. Board the overseer of a significant part of Sacramento/San Joaquin Valley agriculture. Is the Rec. Board prepared to deal with all the issues this will entail?
48-5	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	Is it the Rec. Board's goal to eliminate agriculture from the Valley and return it to a "natural state"?
48-6	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	Title 23 would make agriculture economically and logistically unfeasible in affected areas.

Written Comments Summary

Comment Number	Comment Medium	Source	Comment
48-7	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	It is not possible to prepare a "Comprehensive Plan" without studying new water supplies.
48-8	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	There is now strong public opposition and lack of trust in the Comp. Study. It has done much to unify agriculture, business and local government.
48-9	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	The Resource Management Coalition study has strong local support, and should be viewed as constructive support for solving issues relating to flood damage reduction and environmental resotration.
48-10	letter	San Joaquin River Association, Inc., Jim Cobb, President	State and Federal agencies working on the Comp. Study should join with local communities in the planning process to truly achieve long-term solutions.